DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 315 003 HE 023 169

AUTHOR Buzza, Bonnie Wilson
TITLE Faculty Perceptions of Publication Expectations in the Small College Setting: Have the Rules Changed?
INSTITUTION Wooster Coll., Ohio.
SPONS AGENCY Pew Memorial Trust, Philadelphia, Pa.
PUB DATE Nov 89
NOTE 15p.; Paper presented at the Convention of the Speech Communication Association (San Francisco, CA, November 1989).
PUB TYPE Speecnes/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *College Faculty; *Faculty Publishing; Higher Education; Merit Pay; *Promotion (Occupational); Publish or Perish Issue; Recogn ion (Achievement); *Research; *Small Colleges; *Teacher Attitudes; Tenure; Writing for Publication

ABSTRACT

A survey was conducted to determine if faculty members at small colleges perceived a need to conduct research and to publish in order to have scholarship acknowledged for considerations of tenure, promotion, and merit pay at their institutions; how they felt speech communications compared with other disciplines in this need; and how they believed scholarship to be defined at their institutions. One hundred forty members of the Speech Communication Association Committee on Small College Speech programs received a copy of the survey. Survey results indicated the following: many faculty at small colleges perceived an increased need to conduct and publish research in order to have their scholarship acknowledged for tenure, promotion, and merit; the role of promotion and tenure committees, usually composed primarily of other faculty members, should be explored; and faculty members and deans need to better understand the role of research and publication at their respective institutions, because these factors can increase retention and professional advancement for faculty. A copy of the survey is appended. (SM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED315003

Faculty Perceptions of Publication Expectations in the Small College Setting: Have the Rules Changed?

by
Bonnie Wilson Buzza
Department of Communication
The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691

With research assistance by Julie Whiteaker and Kelli Holmes,
through a grant from the Pew Memorial Trust to the College of Wooster
to support a program of collaborative research between faculty and students.

Presented at the convention
of the Speech Communication Association,
San Francisco, CA,
November 1989.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☑ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Bonnie Wilson Buzza

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

HE 023 169

Faculty Perceptions of Publication Expectations
in the Small College Setting: Have the Rules Changed?

We generally assume that major research is to take place at larger, graduate-oriented institutions. Recently, however, there have been indications that faculty at smaller colleges, which have defined themselves primarily as "teaching institutions," perceive themselves under growing pressure also to produce publishable research.

Many faculty who had felt no pressure to do research at all, and for whom "scholarly activity" had meant demonstrating a level of professional growth in order to enrich teaching, now feel there is an expectation that they will do some sort of research which will have some sort of publication outlet, at least as a finished paper for a convention program. If such had been the expectation, then a growing number of faculty members feel the need to change the type of the research they do and to find a major publication outlet if their careers are to progress (Conversations and discussion, SCA Committee on Small College Speech Programs, 1988 Convention, New Orleans, LA).

Rationale for the Study

If we distinguish research as being either horizontal (applied research, related more to the immediate teaching, curricular, or professional context) or vertical ("pure" research, on the "cutting edge" of disciplines, appropriate for publication in major scholarly journals), then for a number of faculty members who have felt no research pressure, there is now the sense that they must do at least horizontal research; for those who have done horizontal research, there is a sense that vertical research is the expectation. This pressure may be felt in individual cases for tenure or promotion, or it may be felt as a shift in the expectations of the institution as a whole in terms of general recognition for merit or "professional development."

It is important to determine both the extent of these publication expectations and the perception of such publication expectations. With the expected shortage of college professors in the near future, and the likelihood of the shortage's being especially serious on small campuses, faculty retention is critical. Faculty job satisfaction and a smooth flow through the tenure and promotion process are two ways of promoting faculty retention.

Faculty, however, must understand the expectations of their respective institutions for tenure, promotion, and merit considerations; without such shared expectations good faculty may be forced to leave the institution or the profession because of inadequately prepared tenure or promotion review materials rather than because they themselves are inadequately prepared. Delayed or denied promotions have financial and morale implications, and decrease job satisfaction and teaching quality, which in turn affect students and the institution.

Equally serious would be a myth of publication expectation for a particular institution. Rather than faculty members in disagreement with institutional policy they may be in disagreement with perceived institutional policy. They may spend time doing "the wrong thing" both in terms of their own interests and institutional desires, or they may expend time and energy complaining about and resisting activity which is not expected of them at all. This too affects job satisfaction and teaching quality.

National Perceptions

The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching completed their fourth survey of the professorate this past fall. Nearly 5,500 faculty members across the nation responded to questions about job satisfaction and related faculty issues. According to a preliminary report in the Chronicle of Higher Education (August 16, 1989, p. 13), 72% of all professors reported that their interests lay primarily in teaching rather than research, up slightly from the 1984 survey. The figure was 84% for faculty at liberal arts colleges.

The Chronicle continued with the information that 64% of all professors (although only 24% at research universities) agreed that teaching effectiveness should be the main criterion for promotion or tenure. However, while more than 90% of those at research universities who expressed an opinion reported that it was difficult to receive tenure without having published scholarly work, 59% of professors at all types of institutions expressed that belief. This response was up 4% from the 1984 study. Additionally, 37% of all professors agreed that a candidate's publications were counted quantitatively rather than qualitatively in tenure and promotion decisions.

Ernest Boyer, president of the Carnegie Foundation, in discussing the findings, noted that while more professors had reported in the latest survey an interest in teaching, faculty-reward systems at many institutions continued to send mixed signals about the importance of teaching. The percentage of professors who responded that it was difficult to achieve tenure without publishing had risen since the Carnegie Foundation had conducted its first survey in 1969. "It seems to suggest that institutional practice and faculty preference are moving in different directions" Boyer is quoted in The Chronicle, as saying.

Within our own discipline discussion continues about teaching and research. In the September 1989 Spectra, Jim Chesebro considers "a renewed teaching emphasis" but concludes that "we need to conceive of a teacher-scholar as a norm for the discipline of communication" (p. 3). He considers publication rates in SCA journals in recent years and suggests that research/publication efforts cannot and should not be ignored in assessing the quality and status of the discipline. Michael Burgoon, in his article urging the "divorcing of Dame Speech" separates communication teachers and communication scholars into two different disciplines (Communication Education, volume 38, October 1989, pp. 303-308). He renews arguments about the discipline and about its teaching which will no doubt echo loudly in discussions by members of SCA in the next few months.

Cindy Buell, in her summary of Demands for Research and Publication at the Small College (unpublished paper, SCA Convention, San Francisco, CA, 1989) articulated the controversy over the relationship between research and teaching, noting the frequent argument that research enhances teaching, but also the lack of a clear understanding and agreement about what that enhancement really is.

While the actual relationship between the two is still undetermined, faculty members and their institutions have perceptions and opinions about that relationship. Bill Neher considered how that relationship is expressed in faculty handbooks (unpublished paper, SCA Convention, San Francisco, CA, 1989). This paper considers varying perceptions about the need to publish held by faculty members and selected administrators on various small college campuses.

The Current Study

In order to determine if faculty members at small colleges do perceive a need to conduct research and to publish in order to have scholarship acknowledged for considerations of tenure, promotion, and merit pay at their institutions, how they feel Speech Communication compares with other disciplines in this need, and how they believe scholarship to be defined at their institutions, a survey was conducted during July of 1989. For purposes of comparison of faculty perceptions with the perceptions of administrators at their institutions, a small follow-up study was conducted during October of this same year.

Subjects and Survey

The Faculty. The 140 members of the SCA Committee on Small College Speech Programs who had returned preliminary mailing list information received, along with requests to verify names and addresses for the Small College Directory, brief surveys requesting their perceptions about the need to publish in order to receive institutional acknowledgement of their scholarship for tenure, promotion, and merit pay consideration at their institutions. The survey was included along with several questions to assist research being conducted by Roger Smitter. (See Buzza-Smitter survey, attached).

Of the 140 recipients of the survey, which included no return envelope, 95 responded, for a rate of return of approximately 68%. Most returned the surveys along with their directory updates, which no doubt contributed to the high rate of return.

The Deans of Faculty. Because of financial constraints only 30 administrators were surveyed. Deans of Faculty were chosen as subjects because of their involvement in the faculty evaluation process at most, if not all, institutions. A survey comparable to the one sent to faculty members was sent to 30 Deans of Faculty at small colleges in seven Mid-Western states. The Deans were selected because of the presence of a speech communication program on their campuses, determined by whether or not one or more faculty members on their campuses were members of either the Committee on Small College Programs of the Speech Communication Association, the Small College Interest Group of the Central States Communication Association, or the Small College Speech Programs Network of Ohio. One Dean did comment that speech was nearly non-existent on that campus, however.

The state-by-state breakdown, with response rate, was as follows:

	Sent	Returned
Ohio	10	8
Iowa	5	2
Indiana	3	3
Michigan	3	3
Minnesota	3	3
Illinois	3	2
Wisconsin	3	1

Total sent: 30 Total returned: 22 Rate of response: 73%

Return envelopes were enclosed and copies of the finished report offered to interested Deans who requested them by returning their cover letters. Ten Deans, by the way, requested a copy of the results. (See Administrators' Perceptions....survey, attached).

Results and Discussion

Below are comparisons of responses by faculty members and Deans. It should be borne in mind that the numbers of respondents in each group vary considerably. Furthermore, while there was overlap between the institutions of the faculty members and the Deans receiving the survey, anonymity of responses and response rates of some 68% and 73% respectively may mean that not all institutions from which surveys were returned are represented in each group.

Question 1: Perceived "need for research and publication in order to have faculty scholarship acknowledged for tenure, promotion, or 'merit' components of faculty compensation."

	Faculty number,	percentage	Dean number,	percentage
nonexistent	9			
low	**20**	**21%**	**7**	**32%**
moderate	**39**	**41%**	**13**	**59%**
high	**23**	**24%**	**2**	**9%**
intense	4			
n=95			n=22	

Here one might note that while most faculty and Deans felt the publication need was moderate, 41% of the faculty and 59% of the Deans gave that response. Additionally, 32% of the Deans said the need to publish was low; only 21% of the faculty felt the need was low, and 24% said the need was high on their campuses, compared with only 9% of the Deans' saying so. The faculty seems to perceive a greater need for research and publication in order to have their scholarship acknowledged than do the Deans, as reported here.

Question 2: Perceived change in the above need.

	Faculty number,	percentage	Dean number,	percentage
increased greatly	**23**	**25%**	**4**	**18%**
increased slightly	**43**	**46%**	**12**	**55%**
remained same	**26**	**28%**	**6**	**27%**
decreased slightly	1			
decreased greatly				
n=93			n=22	

These findings are consistent with the responses for the first question. A greater percentage of Deans than faculty say that the need to publish has increased slightly; a greater percentage of faculty than Deans say the need to do so has increased greatly. Of particular importance, however, is the agreement between the two groups that there has been an increase in the need to publish, over 70% of each group saying so.

We can conclude that there is the perception of at least a moderate need to conduct and publish research in order to have faculty scholarship acknowledged by institutions, although faculty see more of a need than do Deans, but that both groups agree that the need for such research and publication has increased.

Question 3: Source of the pressure for research and publication. (Respondents checked all that applied).

	Faculty number,	percentage	Dean number,	percentage
self (fac. mbr.)	**51**	**54%**	**12**	**55%**
department	**18**	**19%**	**5**	**23%**
P&T Comm.	**41**	**44%**	**10**	**45%**
"the faculty"	**18**	**19%**	**9**	**41%**
the Dean	**37**	**39%**	**13**	**59%**
"the admin."	**39**	**41%**	**11**	**50%**
	n=94		n=22	

Interestingly, the source of most of the pressure to publish is generated by the individual faculty member him or herself. The questionnaire did not ask WHY such pressure was felt, and thus it is not clear if the faculty member has a special interest in doing research; feels individual pressure because he or she very much wants tenure, promotion, or merit acknowledgement; is particularly competitive; or for some other reason. Deans and faculty members were very close in their agreement on the primary source of the pressure, however.

They were also in close agreement on a second source of pressure, Promotion and Tenure Committees. The Deans saw themselves and also "the administration" providing pressure to publish, while fewer faculty members felt this to be the case. Additionally, Deans saw increased pressure to publish coming from the faculty as a whole and from individual departments. Fewer faculty members had this perception. Note might be made of the unexpected finding that Deans overall saw somewhat less of an increase in the need to publish, but saw many more sources of such pressure. Faculty, who saw a greater increase in the need to publish, attributed it to more limited sources.

Question 4: Need to do research and publish for faculty in Speech Communication, compared with those in other disciplines.

	Faculty number,	percentage	Dean number,	percentage
much less			**1**	**5%**
less	**14**	**15%**	**2**	**9%**
equal	**70**	**77%**	**16***	**73%**
more	**7**	**8%**	**1**	**5%**
much more			**2**	**9%**
	n=91		n=22	

*Although responding, two Deans indicated the need was equal among faculty of all disciplines.

Here there was agreement about a generally equal need for faculty in Speech Communication to conduct research, compared with other disciplines. Note should be taken, however, of the "bell curve" which took place among the Deans' responses, and particularly the fact that some felt there was much more need for faculty in Speech Communication to conduct research and to publish than for faculty in other disciplines to do so. While this is balanced by other Deans' saying there is less need, questions about

WHY Deans gave their answers should sometime be posed. Faculty, however, also gave mixed responses.

Question 5: Rank order of the need by disciplines to conduct research... Here many respondents did not follow the directions. Seven choices were listed; 56 of the 84 faculty responding to the question ranked all 7, 10 ranked only the first 3, 18 merely checked various of the options. Among the Deans 11 ranked all 7 choices, 8 stated that all were equal, and 3 did not rank any. Data are reported for only those respondents ranking all 7 choices; only ranks of 1, 2, or 3 are listed below.

Discipline	Faculty Rank of 1	of 2	of 3	Dean Rank of 1	of 2	of 3
Chemistry	**28**	**7**	**5**	**6**	**1**	**1**
English	9	9	10	1	2	3
History	4	12	11	2	4	1
Political Science	1	8	12	1	1	3
Psychology	**14**	**21**	**6**	**1**	**2**	**1**
Speech Comm.	**0**	**1**	**12**	**0**	**0**	**0**
Theatre/Drama	0	0	0	0	1	1

(Of those ranking only 3 disciplines, Chemistry received the first place rank 3 times. Among those checking various options rather than ranking, nearly everyone checked all options every time).

Chemistry was the clear winner in the need to do publishable research when faculty respondents ranked the disciplines. Psychology was a strong second, with History and English ranking highly, as well. Ranks were more scattered among the Deans, many of whom declined to rank at all. One can note the need for Speech Communication research ranking higher in faculty perceptions than in Deans', although the numbers overall are quite low.

Question 6: Perceived "Institutional definition of 'scholarship' for purposes of tenure, promotion ..." (Respondents checked all that applied)

	Faculty number,	percentage	Dean number,	percentage
"keeping up"	**66**	**71%**	**16**	**76%**
convention papers	**86**	**92%**	**21**	**100%**
horizontal res.	**55**	**59%**	**18**	**86%**
vertical res.	**63**	**68%**	**18**	**86%**
publ."somewhere"	**66**	**71%**	**13**	**62%**
major journal	**55**	**59%**	**14**	**66%**
grant proposal	**42**	**45%**	**15**	**71%**
getting grant	**52**	**56%**	**12**	**57%**
pln. conference	**24**	**26%**	**11**	**52%**
other	16		2**	
	included such things as continuing education, consulting, writing books, productions		see comments discussed later	
	n=95		n=21	

The significance of convention presentations should be noted for its 100% inclusion by responding Deans. Faculty perceptions were close with 92%. Deans next tied the doing of horizontal and vertical research (86% each), then acknowledged the role of

generally "keeping up" with one's discipline (76%), then the writing of grant proposals (71%), and in fifth place having an article published in a major journal (66%).

Faculty tied second place as"keeping up" in the discipline and getting published "somewhere" (71%), then selected vertical research (68%), then tied horizontal research and publication in a major journal (59%). Their fifth rank was obtaining a grant (56%).

Note should be taken of the differing perceptions of faculty and Deans after the first ranking of convention presentations. It should also be noted that over half of the Deans selected each alternative presented, including hosting a conference, and a higher percentage of Deans selected each alternative than did faculty members. This suggests that Deans may interpret scholarship more broadly than faculty members perceive their institutions to do.

Respondents were also asked to rank the three primary factors in defining scholarship, from the list above. Percentages of ranks of primary responses were as follow:

	Faculty			Dean		
Factor	Rank of 1	of 2	of 3	Rank of 1	of 2	of 3
"keeping up"	**12%**			**31%**		
convention papers	**12%**	**23%**	**44%**	**18%**	**21%**	**36%**
horizontal res.	**12%**	**14%**		**18%**	**21%**	
vertical res.	**12%**			**12%**	**36%**	
publ."somewhere"	**12%**	**28%**				**36%**
major journal	**33%**				**14%**	
grant proposal						
getting grant		**14%**	**12%**			
pln. conference						
	n=44			n=16 for rank 1, 14 for rank 2 & 3		

Here again convention presentations finished strongly by both groups. However, faculty rank major publications more strongly than do Deans. Deans continue to value "keeping up" in the discipline and place a greater emphasis on both horizontal and vertical research than do faculty, and faculty members see greater value to actually obtaining a grant than do the Deans.

In addition, two Deans wrote extensive comments on the questionnaires:

A: "As a part of what we understand to be good teaching at ____--creativity in one's discipline is an important aspect of teaching. For liberal arts colleges, I prefer a research project which includes student participation. I am concerned that this questionnaire does not reflect our philosophy of creativity at ___. I would welcome the opportunity to speak with you in more detail about it. (Signed)"

B: "I do not mean to demean research as such--but with a small faculty teaching four courses a semester plus in our January interim classical research for publication purposes is practically impossible at _____. We place a great deal of emphasis on teaching, advising, service to the community for our tenure decision."

Conclusions

It appears from the present research that many faculty at small colleges do perceive need, and an increased need, to conduct and publish research in order to have their scholarship acknowledged for tenure, promotion, and merit components of faculty salary compensation. This same perception is shared by many of their Deans, although they note less of an increase in pressures to publish than do the faculty.

When these findings are coupled with the Carnegie Report's findings of a clear faculty preference for teaching, the potential exists for conflict between faculties and their institutions. If the trends continue, faculty job satisfaction and retention could become problems.

However, additional questions need to be asked about the source of such pressures to publish, which come in part from faculty members themselves. Knowing why faculty feel the personal need, acknowledged by both Deans and faculty, can help faculty development programs in their response to faculty and institutional concerns.

The role of Promotion and Tenure Committees, usually composed primarily of other faculty members, should also be explored, along with the broader explanation of the need as noted by Deans, and the narrower need as noted by faculty members.

Members of the discipline should continue to explore the need for faculty research and publication in Speech Communication, but that discussion seems to have been re-launched recently and will no doubt continue for some time.

The Speech Communication Association, along with the regional and state associations, should be heartened by the acknowledgement of the role of convention participation in demonstrating faculty scholarship. The encouragement of participation by association members should continue, and individual program planners and groups should be reminded of the importance of such participation in the professional development of faculty members.

However, faculty members and Deans need to consider and discuss their differing perceptions about the value of other ways of demonstrating scholarship, to assure a shared understanding of expectations and responsibilities in the tenure, promotion, and merit evaluation process.

Finally, faculty members should feel heartened by the comments of the two Deans, quoted above. They show a real sensitivity to faculty teaching commitment and time constraints.

In conclusion, the present research shows a need for better understanding by faculty members and Deans of the role of research and publication at their respective institutions. Such understanding will likely be an element in the retention and professional advancement of faculty members, two factors which will increase in importance to faculty members and their institutions in the next decade.

The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691

Department of Communication
Bonnie W. Buzza, Chair
(216) 263-2030 or 263-2541

Some time ago work began on a directory of members of the SCA Committee on Small College Speech Programs. That Directory is now almost complete.

Attached you will find a draft of the material you sent us for the directory. We'd like you to check it for changes or corrections.

Page 1: Please update and correct as needed.

Page 2: Please complete by checking the relevant boxes so that we can provide members with easy access to colleagues with related research interests or whose teaching preferences might help in developing a new course.

Pages 3-4: Please help Bonnie Buzza and Roger Smitter by responding to these few questions about your students and your perceptions of research/ publication pressures at your schools. Results will be presented at SCA's San Francisco convention.

When complete, please return all the material enclosed to:
Bonnie W. Buzza
Department of Communication
The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691

It will help greatly if you can return the material by August 25. Thanks for your assistance and cooperation. The Directory will be completed early in the fall.

Bonnie W. Buzza
SCA Small College Committee

Kelli S. Holmes
College of Wooster Research Assistant

Buzza-Smitter Survey

A. Some faculty members who teach at small colleges have recently indicated that they feel an increasing need to conduct research and to publish in scholarly journals in order to have their scholarship acknowledged for tenure, promotion, or "merit" components of faculty compensation. In institutions where there had been little previous need for research or publication, some faculty feel now that "horizontal research" (i.e., research which supports classroom teaching, program development, and personal scholarship) is becoming necessary; where previously such research was all that was needed, some faculty now feel that "vertical research" (i.e., research which seeks to advance the discipline per se, "cutting edge" research) is becoming necessary. This short survey is an effort to see how wide-spread this perception may be.

1. The need for research and publication in order to have faculty scholarship acknowledged for tenure, promotion, or "merit" components of faculty compensation at my institution seems to be

- ☐ Nonexistent
- ☐ Low
- ☐ Moderate
- ☐ High
- ☐ Intense

2. In the past several years this need seems to have

- ☐ Increased greatly
- ☐ Increased slightly
- ☐ Remained the same
- ☐ Decreased slightly
- ☐ Decreased greatly

3. The pressure for research and publication, if it exists, seems to come from (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Myself
- ☐ The department
- ☐ The Promotion and Tenure Committee
- ☐ The faculty as a whole
- ☐ The Dean
- ☐ The Administration"

4. Compared to faculty in other disciplines, for faculty in Speech Communication the need for research and publication, if it exists, seems to be

- ☐ Much less
- ☐ Less
- ☐ About the same
- ☐ More
- ☐ Much more

5. Please rank order your perception of the need to conduct research and to publish in order to have scholarship acknowledged for tenure, promotion, or "merit" components of faculty compensation, using the following disciplines for the rankings. (1 as the most necessary.)

- ☐ Chemistry
- ☐ English
- ☐ History
- ☐ Political Science
- ☐ Psychology
- ☐ Speech Communication
- ☐ Theatre or Drama

6. In what ways does "scholarship" seem to be defined at your institution for purposes of tenure, promotion, or "merit" components of faculty compensation? (Check all that apply.)

- ☐ Attending conventions, reading journals, "keeping up"
- ☐ Giving convention papers and/or being on convention panels
- ☐ Conducting research or doing writing related to your courses or program ("Horizontal Research")
- ☐ Conducting research to advance the discipline ("Vertical Research"
- ☐ Getting published "somewhere"
- ☐ Getting published in a major journal
- ☐ Writing a grant proposal
- ☐ Obtaining a grant
- ☐ Hosting a conference
- ☐ Other (Please describe.)_____

(Of those you have checked ,please rank the three most important; 1 as most important.)

B. We are seeking to learn faculty perceptions of departmental growth or decline concerning the numbers of Speech Communication majors, the quality of their academic performances, and whether or not they made their decision to major AFTER their arrival on campus. Please respond to these five questions.

1. Approximately how many students currently indicate Speech or Communication (or Speech Communication) as their major on your campus? _____

2. What has been the pattern of growth or decline over the past three years in this number?
   ☐ Dramatic Growth ☐ Growth ☐ No Change ☐ Decline ☐ Dramatic Decline

3. If a change has occurred over the past three years, how many majors were gained (+) or lost (-)? _____

4. In your judgement, has the quality of the academic performance of the Speech Communication majors changed over the past three years on your campus?
   ☐ Much Improved ☐ Improved ☐ No Change ☐ Declined ☐ Significant Decline

5. Approximately what percentage of the current Speech Communication majors in your department have selected the discipline for their major **SINCE** they began their college careers? _____%

Thank you for your assistance. It will help greatly if you can return the material by August 25. When complete, please return to:

Bonnie W. Buzza
Department of Communication
The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691

The College of Wooster
Wooster, Ohio 44691 USA
216/263-2541

Department of Communication
Communication Studies
Communication Sciences and Disorders

October 16, 1989

Some faculty members who teach at small colleges have recently indicated that they feel an increasing need to conduct research and to publish in scholarly journals in order to have their scholarship acknowledged for tenure, promotion, or "merit" components of faculty compensation at their institutions.

In institutions where there had been little previous need for research or publication, some faculty feel now that "horizontal research" (i.e., research which supports classroom teaching, program development, and personal scholarship) is becoming necessary. Where previously such research was all that was needed, some faculty now feel that "vertical research" (i.e., research which seeks to advance the discipline per se, "cutting edge" research) is becoming necessary.

This short survey is part of an effort to assess the prevalence this perception of an increasing need to publish, and to compare perceptions between faculty members in Speech Communication and administrators who may be involved in the tenure and promotion process at small colleges. Results of the survey will be presented at the Speech Communication Association's national convention in San Francisco in November.

I will greatly appreciate your taking time to respond to the six questions attached, and returning the form to me in the envelope provided. If you would like a copy of the results, indicate your name and address below and I will send them to you. Thank you for your assistance.

Cordially,

Bonnie W. Buzza

Bonnie Wilson Buzza
Professor and Chair
Department of Communication

Send survey results to:

Name _____

Address _____

_____ zip _____

Administrators' Perceptions of Faculty Publication Need

1. The need for research and publication in order to have faculty scholarship acknowledged for tenure, promotion, or "merit" components of faculty compensation at this institution seems to be

____ nonexistent ____ low ____ moderate ____ high ____ intense

2. In the past several years this need seems to have

____ increased greatly
____ remained the same
____ decreased greatly
____ increased slightly
____ decreased slightly

3. This pressure for research and publication, if it exists, seems to come from (check all that apply)

____ individual faculty members ____ the department
____ the faculty as a whole ____ the Promotion and Tenure Committee
____ the Dean ____ "the Administration"

4. Compared to faculty in other disciplines at this institution, for faculty in Speech Communication the need for this research and publication, if it exists, seems to be

____ much less
____ less
____ about the same
____ more
____ much more

5. Please rank order your perception of the need to conduct research and to publish in order to have scholarship acknowledged for tenure, promotion, or "merit" components of faculty compensation at your institution, using the following disciplines for the rankings. (in 1 it is the most necessary...)

____ Chemistry ____ English ____ History ____ Political Science
____ Psychology ____ Speech Communication ____ Theatre or Drama

6. In what ways does "scholarship" seem to be defined at your institution for purposes of tenure, promotion, or "merit" components of faculty compensation? (check all that apply)

____ attending conventions, reading journals, "keeping up"
____ giving convention papers and/or being on convention panels
____ conducting research or doing writing related to your courses or program ("horizontal research")
____ conducting research to advance the discipline ("vertical research")
____ getting published "somewhere"
____ getting published in a major journal
____ writing a grant proposal
____ obtaining a grant
____ hosting a conference
____ other (please describe)_____

Of those you have checked please rank the three most important factors with 1 as the most important.

Thank you again for your assistance. A return envelope is provided for your convenience.